



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,977	03/05/2002	David D. Rowley	23415-014	9574
909	7590	07/13/2005	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP			HARRIS, CHANDA L	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA 22102			3714	

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/087,977	ROWLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chanda L. Harris	3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/7/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

In response to the Amendment filed 10/14/04, Claims 1-38 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harned (as applied and maintained in the last office action) in view of Bugnion et al. (US 6,075,938).

Regarding Claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 26, and 31-38, Harned does not disclose expressly wherein the one or more virtual machines are configured to run an operating system, wherein the one or more virtual machines are selected from a plurality of virtual machines, and wherein the one or more virtual machines include a first virtual machine that is configured to run a first operating system and a second virtual machine that is configured to run a second operating system different from the first operating system. However, Bugnion teaches such in Col.5: 61-64 and Col.7: 52-58 (i.e., multiple virtual machines that run independent operating systems and application programs). Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 3714

in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Harned, in light of the teaching of Bugnion, in order to provide a way of introducing new and innovative system software while still providing a stable computing base for applications that favor stability over innovation.

Claim 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harned (as applied and maintained in the last office action) in view of Chang et al. (Re. 36, 462).

Regarding Claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 26, and 31-38, Harned does not disclose expressly wherein the one or more virtual machines are configured to run an operating system, wherein the one or more virtual machines are selected from a plurality of virtual machines, and wherein the one or more virtual machines include a first virtual machine that is configured to run a first operating system and a second virtual machine that is configured to run a second operating system different from the first operating system. However, Chang teaches such in Col.7: 41-52 (i.e., a Virtual Resource Manager program which functions to permit a number of virtual machines to be created, each of which is operating a different operating system). Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Harned, in light of the teaching of Chang, in order to enable the system to operate in a multi-tasking, multi-user environment.

Claim 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harned (as applied and maintained in the last office action) in view of Borruso et al. (US 5,621,912).

Regarding Claims 1, 6, 12, 17, 21, 26, and 31-38, Harned does not disclose expressly wherein the one or more virtual machines are configured to run an operating system, wherein the one or more virtual machines are selected from a plurality of virtual machines, and wherein the one or more virtual machines include a first virtual machine that is configured to run a first operating system and a second virtual machine that is configured to run a second operating system different from the first operating system. However, Borruso teaches such in Col.2: 45-53 (i.e., the virtual machine environment permits many different operating systems to exist simultaneously). Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the aforementioned limitations into the method and system of Harned, in light of the teaching of Borruso, in order to automatically provide independent operation to ensure data integrity and security.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- **Breslau et al. (US 6,345,311)**

-heterogeneous execution environments

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See rejection above. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanda L. Harris whose telephone number is 571-272-4448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica Harrison can be reached on 571-272-4449. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Chanda L. Harris
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3714